

REMARKS

During a telephonic interview between the undersigned attorney and the examiner on January 11, 2005, the various rejections of the claims were discussed with respect to the present invention and the cited prior art references. A summary of the telephonic interview is presented below. At the conclusion of the telephonic interview, it was agreed that Hoyle does not teach or suggest selecting, using the selected keyword information, specific text in the first document to be marked up, wherein the specific text is contextually associated with at least a portion of the selected keyword information; and performing, at the client computer system, markup operations on at least a portion of said selected specific text. It was further agreed that Hoyle does not teach or suggest identifying, using the selected keyword information, specific context specific text in the first document, wherein the specific text is contextually associated with at least a portion of the selected keyword information; and displaying a selected pop-up advertisement based on identified context at least a portion of the identified text within the first document.

Claims 1, 6, 7, 8, 18, 24, 30, 33, 34, 36, 37, 41, 43, 45, 55, 61, 62, 67, 69, 70, and 72 have been amended for clarification purposes and to avoid ambiguity.

New claims 75-78 have been added to the application.

Independent claims 1, 33, 41, and 69 of the present application are rejected by the examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hoyle. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As amended, claim 1 is directed to a method for generating markup information to be displayed on a client computer system, comprising in part: selecting, using the selected keyword information, specific text in the first document to be marked up, wherein the specific text is contextually associated with at least a portion of the selected keyword information; and performing, at the client computer system, markup operations on at least a portion of said selected specific text.

During the telephonic interview, it was agreed that Hoyle does not teach or suggest selecting, using the selected keyword information, specific text in the first document to be marked up, wherein the specific text is contextually associated with at least a portion of the selected keyword information; and performing, at the client computer system, markup operations on at least a portion of said selected specific text. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 1 is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of Hoyle, and is therefore believed to be allowable.

Amended claim 33 is directed to a method for generating pop-up advertising information to be displayed on a client computer system, comprising in part: identifying, using the selected keyword information, specific text in the first document, wherein the specific text is contextually associated with at least a portion of the selected keyword information; and displaying a selected pop-up advertisement based on at least a portion of the identified text within the first document.

During the telephonic interview, it was agreed that that Hoyle does not teach or suggest identifying, using the selected keyword information, specific context specific text in the first document, wherein the specific text is contextually associated with at least a portion of the selected keyword information; and displaying a selected pop-up advertisement based on identified context at least a portion of the identified text within the first document. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 33 is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of Hoyle, and is therefore believed to be allowable.

Independent claim 41 defines features similar to those defined in claim 1, and is therefore believed to be allowable for at least those reasons stated above in support of claim 1. Additionally, dependent claims 2-32, and 41-68 are also believed to be allowable since they depend upon independent claims 1 and 41 respectively.

Independent claim 69 defines features similar to those defined in claim 33, and is therefore believed to be allowable for at least those reasons stated above in support of claim 33. Additionally, dependent claims 34-40, and 70-78 are also believed to be allowable since they depend either upon independent claim 33 or 69.

Because claims 1-78 are believed to be allowable in their present form, many of the examiner's rejections in the Office Action have not been addressed in this response. However, applicant respectfully reserves the right to respond to one or more of the examiner's rejections in subsequent amendments should conditions arise warranting such responses.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

Dean E. Wolf
Reg. No. 37,260

P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778